



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/974,515	10/09/2001	Richard Edward Shelton	51919-1041	1304
24504	7590	05/01/2007	EXAMINER	
THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, LLP 100 GALLERIA PARKWAY, NW STE 1750 ATLANTA, GA 30339-5948			BASHORE, WILLIAM L	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2176				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/01/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<i>Office Action Summary</i>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/974,515	SHELTON ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
	William L. Bashore	2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 March 2007.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-132 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-132 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: RCE filed 3/23/2007, to the application filed 10/9/2001. Present case is a reissue of case 07/540,382, which is a continuation of case 07/322,740. IDS filed 10/9/2001. Applicant claims priority to **3/13/1989**.
2. Claims 1-132 pending. Claims 1, 7, 30, 49, 68, 89, 114, 132 are independent claims.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

3. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 3/23/2007 has been entered.

4. **Independent claims 1, 7, 30, 49, 68, 89, 114 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 251 as being broadened in a reissue application filed outside the two year statutory period.**

In regard to independent claims 1, 7, the broadening feature in each said claim relates to “*assigning a plurality of tiles to each of said objects, respectively, in said object list*”.

In regard to independent claims 30, 89, 114, the broadening feature in each said claim relates to “*associating a plurality of tiles with each of said objects, respectively, in said object list...*”.

In regard to independent claim 49, the broadening feature in said claim relates to “*associating said plurality of first tiles with each of said objects, respectively, in said first object list*”.

In regard to independent claim 68, the broadening feature in said claim relates to “*associating each of said objects in said object list with a plurality of tiles, respectively...*”.

A claim is broader in scope than the original claims if it contains within its scope any conceivable product or process which would not have infringed the original patent. A claim is broadened if it is broader in any one respect even though it may be narrower in other respects.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. **Claims 1-132 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.**

Regarding independent claims 1, 7, 30, 48, 68, 89, 114, 132 (and all dependent claims by virtue of reliance to their respective base claims), claim 1 has been amended to recite “assigning a plurality of tiles to each of said objects...” (all other independent claims have been similarly amended). The examiner cannot find any support in the instant specification in support of this limitation.

For purposes of art rejection, the above limitation is given a possible interpretation of the above limitation as directed to assigning “one” tile.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-12, 14-15, 18-26, 28-32, 37-45, 47-48, 89-97, 101-110, 112-117, 119-128, 130-132, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Using 1-2-3 Special Edition (hereinafter Using 1-2-3), cited in Applicant's submitted IDS.

In regard to independent claim 1, Using 1-2-3 teaches the claimed steps of:

“entering a command...to display a form”: Using 1-2-3’s File Retrieve Instruction (see pp. 756-757).

“obtaining an object list”: Using 1-2-3’s step of obtaining cell information, e.g. numbers, text and formulas (see p. 13).

“assigning tiles to objects”: Using 1-2-3’s step of assigning a cell to the cell information (see p. 13).

“displaying the tiles”: Using 1-2-3’s cell display (see pp. 13-15 and Figure 1.1).

It is noted that Using 1-2-3 does not specifically teach assigning a single tile to a group of objects and assigning a single tile to an individual object. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have employed such “assignments”, since Using 1-2-3 provides assignments which are at least suggestive of the claimed assignments. For example, Using 1-2-3’s assignment of +A1+B1 to cell C1 (see p. 16) is the assignment of A1 (object #1) and B1 (object #2) to single cell (“title”) D1. Therefore, Using 1-2-3 renders the claimed “title assignments” obvious, when the term “object” is given its broadest reasonable interpretation.

In regard to dependent claim 2, it is noted that Using 1-2-3 does not specifically teach the claimed steps of “moving”, “drawing”, and “repeating”. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to perform such “steps” since Using 1-2-3 teaches a display (see p. 49, Figure 2.6), which is generated in a functionally equivalent manner. Therefore, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to form a system upon which claim 2 reads.

Regarding dependent claim 3, Using 1-2-3’s step of deleting characters (pp. 66-68), deleting rows and columns of data (pp. 98-101) and deleting files (see pp. 277-278) are equivalent to the claimed steps of “eliminating an object”.

It is noted that Using 1-2-3 does not specifically teach a “prioritization list”. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide such a feature, since Using 1-2-3 teaches a menu (“list”) which provides different methods of data prioritization (see pp. 274-277). Data is arranged according to the prioritization rules. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have formed a system upon which claim 3 reads.

Regarding dependent claim 4, Using 1-2-3 teaches the claimed text region and data region. For example, if cell C1 contains “ALPHA + 100”, the region of the cell containing the variable name ALPHA is the “text region”, while the region of the cell containing the value 100 is the “data region”. Therefore, Using 1-2-3 teaches the claimed “regions”.

In regard to dependent claim 5, Using 1-2-3 teaches the claimed:
“physical size”: Using 1-2-3’s width (see p. 19).
“display rule”: Using 1-2-3’s cell format (see p. 13).
“access table”: Using 1-2-3’s password function (see pp. 22-23).

“tile name”: Using 1-2-3’s row-column name (see p. 13).

It is noted that Using 1-2-3 does not specifically teach storage of “time entries”. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide such a feature, since Using 1-2-3 teaches date and time functions (see p. 18) which permits the capture of the current date and time from the system clock. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have formed a system upon which claim 5 reads.

In regard to dependent claim 6, it is noted that Using 1-2-3 does not explicitly teach “displaying a pop up menu” corresponding to a region of a tile. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide a pop-up menu, since Using 1-2-3 teaches the display of related data in a pop-up control panel upon the selection of a cell (see pp. 49-50). Furthermore, it should be noted that it is common knowledge to the skilled artisan to provide pop-up menus to enhance the user-friendliness of the user interface. In fact, Using 1-2-3 discusses the use of supplementary software programs which can be added to Using 1-2-3 to improve said user-friendliness (e.g. pop-up notepad windows) (see pp. 33-35). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to form a system upon which claim 6 reads.

In regard to independent claim 7, Using 1-2-3 teaches the claimed steps of:

“*entering a command...to display a form*”: Using 1-2-3’s File Retrieve Instruction (see pp. 756-757).

“*obtaining an object list*”: Using 1-2-3’s step of obtaining cell information, e.g. numbers, text and formulas (see p. 13).

“*assigning tiles to objects*”: Using 1-2-3’s step of assigning a cell to the cell information (see p. 13).

“*displaying the tiles*”: Using 1-2-3’s cell display (see pp. 13-15 and Figure 1.1).

It is noted that Using 1-2-3 does not specifically teach assigning a single tile to a group of objects and assigning a single tile to an individual object. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have employed such “assignments”, since Using 1-2-3 provides assignments which are at least suggestive of the claimed assignments. For example, Using 1-2-3’s assignment of +A1+B1 to cell C1 (see p. 16) is the assignment of A1 (object #1) and B1 (object #2) to single cell (“title”) D1. Therefore, Using 1-2-3 renders the claimed “title assignments” obvious, when the term “object” is given its broadest reasonable interpretation.

Using 1-2-3’s step of deleting characters (pp. 66-68), deleting rows and columns of data (pp. 98-101) and deleting files (see pp. 277-278) are equivalent to the claimed steps of “eliminating an object”.

It is noted that Using 1-2-3 does not specifically teach a “prioritization list”. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide such a feature, since Using 1-2-3 teaches a menu (“list”) which provides different methods of data prioritization (see pp. 274-277). Data is arranged according to the prioritization rules. Therefore, this feature would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

In regard to dependent claims 8, 9, 10, 11, claims 8, 9, 10, 11 are directed to substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claims 2 and 4-6 respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 12, Using 1-2-3 teaches hiding columns (e.g. cells or “tiles”) in a spreadsheet (see p. 101), providing reasonable suggestion to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to refrain from displaying a column (e.g. tile(s) without any objects), providing the benefit of compacting a spreadsheet accordingly.

In regard to dependent claim 14, Using 1-2-3 teaches a keyboard (see p. 29 – at middle “1-2-3 uses virtually every key on the PC’s keyboard”).

In regard to dependent claim 15, Using 1-2-3 teaches text (see p. 98 Figure 4.18).

In regard to dependent claim 18, Using 1-2-3 teaches the IBM PC, as well as a color/monochrome monitor (see pp. 29-30). It was well known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that PCs typically comprised monitors which were/are forms of cathode ray tubes.

In regard to dependent claim 19, Using 1-2-3 teaches the shape of the overall displayed spreadsheet is at least dependent upon the conglomeration of each individual cell (tile) shape. Columns of tiles not displayed also influence the final spreadsheet shape (see p. 101 Figure at top of page, also section “Hiding Columns”).

In regard to dependent claim 20, Using 1-2-3 teaches individual cell (tile) shapes displayed accordingly, each rectangular in shape with selected widths, etc. (see p. 101).

In regard to dependent claim 21, Using 1-2-3 teaches tiles referenced by letters and numbers (see p. 101 – Figure at top of page).

In regard to dependent claim 22, Using 1-2-3 teaches editing data in a worksheet (see pp. 66-67). As Using 1-2-3 changes to EDIT mode, the contents of a cell is duplicated in the control panel for editing. Since Using 1-2-3 teaches editing of one cell at a time (see p. 67 at bottom), this provides reasonable suggestion to the skilled artisan at the time of the invention to apply editing of one cell while blocking editing of all other cells at the same time, so as to prevent conflicts.

In regard to dependent claims 23, 24, Using 1-2-3 teaches the claimed: “access table”: Using 1-2-3’s password function, which logs a user accordingly (see pp. 22-23).

It is noted that Using 1-2-3 does not specifically teach storage of recording a time of entry. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide such a feature, since Using 1-2-3 teaches date and time functions (see p. 18) which permits the capture of the current date and time from the system clock. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have formed a system upon which claim 24 reads.

In regard to dependent claim 25, Using 1-2-3 teaches changing a formula within a cell (see p. 67 – at bottom). It is noted that the editing of said formula results in a mixture of new and original data (e.g. D4 is changed to C4, all else is original).

In regard to dependent claim 26, Using 1-2-3 teaches an insertion point for editing original input (see p. 68). It is noted that Using 1-2-3 teaches a cursor position insert mode in the form of a marker (an underscore). As a new character is entered in EDIT mode (the letter “C”), said new letter is normally inserted to the left of the cursor, therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to differentiate between original data, and new data to be added, via knowledge of the tracking position of the taught cursor marker, providing the benefit of concise editing.

In regard to dependent claim 28, Using 1-2-3 teaches a control panel showing three lines to help a user as said user edits a cell accordingly (see pp. 49-51). In addition, since Using 1-2-3 possesses the capability of saving, copying, editing, etc. these features are made available to the user as said user targets a cell accordingly, therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide said capability to each cell for better organization of a spreadsheet (see also pp. 66-68).

In regard to dependent claim 29, Using 1-2-3 teaches editing data (making an entry) in a cell of a spreadsheet (see pp. 66-68).

In regard to independent claim 30, Using 1-2-3 teaches the claimed steps of:

“*entering a command...to display a form*”: Using 1-2-3’s File Retrieve Instruction (see pp. 756-757).

“*obtaining an object list*”: Using 1-2-3’s step of obtaining cell information, e.g. numbers, text and formulas (see p. 13).

“*assigning tiles to objects*”: Using 1-2-3’s step of assigning a cell to the cell information (see p. 13).

“*displaying the tiles*”: Using 1-2-3’s cell display (see pp. 13-15 and Figure 1.1).

It is noted that Using 1-2-3 does not specifically teach assigning a single tile to a group of objects and assigning a single tile to an individual object. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have employed such “assignments”, since Using 1-2-3 provides assignments which are at least suggestive of the claimed assignments. For example, Using 1-2-3’s assignment of +A1+B1 to cell C1 (see p. 16) is the assignment of A1 (object #1) and B1 (object #2) to single cell (“title”) D1. Therefore, Using 1-2-3 renders the claimed “title assignments” obvious, when the term “object” is given its broadest reasonable interpretation.

Using 1-2-3 teaches hiding columns (e.g. cells or “tiles”) in a spreadsheet (see p. 101), providing reasonable suggestion to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to refrain from displaying a tile(s) without any objects, providing the benefit of compacting a spreadsheet accordingly.

In regard to dependent claim 31, Using 1-2-3 teaches a keyboard (see p. 29 – at middle “1-2-3 uses virtually every key on the PC’s keyboard”).

In regard to dependent claim 32, Using 1-2-3 teaches text (see p. 98 Figure 4.18).

In regard to dependent claim 37, Using 1-2-3 teaches the IBM PC, as well as a color/monochrome monitor (see pp. 29-30). It was well known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that PCs typically comprised monitors which were/are forms of cathode ray tubes.

In regard to dependent claim 38, Using 1-2-3 teaches the shape of the overall displayed spreadsheet is at least dependent upon the conglomeration of each individual cell (tile) shape. Columns of tiles not displayed also influence the final spreadsheet shape (see p. 101 Figure at top of page, also section “Hiding Columns”).

In regard to dependent claim 39, Using 1-2-3 teaches individual cell (tile) shapes displayed accordingly, each rectangular in shape with selected widths, etc. (see p. 101).

In regard to dependent claim 40, Using 1-2-3 teaches tiles referenced by letters and numbers (see p. 101 – Figure at top of page).

In regard to dependent claim 41, Using 1-2-3 teaches editing data in a worksheet (see pp. 66-67). As Using 1-2-3 changes to EDIT mode, the contents of a cell is duplicated in the control panel for editing. Since Using 1-2-3 teaches editing of one cell at a time (see p. 67 at bottom), this provides reasonable suggestion to the skilled artisan at the time of the invention to apply editing of one cell while blocking editing of all other cells at the same time, so as to prevent conflicts.

In regard to dependent claims 42, 43, Using 1-2-3 teaches the claimed: “access table”: Using 1-2-3’s password function, which logs a user accordingly (see pp. 22-23).

It is noted that Using 1-2-3 does not specifically teach storage of recording a time of entry. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide such a feature, since Using 1-2-3 teaches date and time functions (see p. 18) which permits the capture of the current date and

time from the system clock. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have formed a system upon which claim 43 reads.

In regard to dependent claim 44, Using 1-2-3 teaches changing a formula within a cell (see p. 67 – at bottom). It is noted that the editing of said formula results in a mixture of new and original data (e.g. D4 is changed to C4, all else is original).

In regard to dependent claim 45, Using 1-2-3 teaches an insertion point for editing original input (see p. 68). It is noted that Using 1-2-3 teaches a cursor position insert mode in the form of a marker (an underscore). As a new character is entered in EDIT mode (the letter “C”), said new letter is normally inserted to the left of the cursor, therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to differentiate between original data, and new data to be added, via knowledge of the tracking position of the taught cursor marker, providing the benefit of concise editing.

In regard to dependent claim 47, Using 1-2-3 teaches a control panel showing three lines to help a user as said user edits a cell accordingly (see pp. 49-51). In addition, since Using 1-2-3 possesses the capability of saving, copying, editing, etc. these features are made available to the user as said user targets a cell accordingly, therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide said capability to each cell for better organization of a spreadsheet (see also pp. 66-68).

In regard to dependent claim 48, Using 1-2-3 teaches editing data (making an entry) in a cell of a spreadsheet (see pp. 66-68).

In regard to independent claim 89, Using 1-2-3 teaches the claimed steps of: “*entering a command...to display a form*”: Using 1-2-3’s File Retrieve Instruction (see pp. 756-757).

“obtaining an object list”: Using 1-2-3’s step of obtaining cell information, e.g. numbers, text and formulas (see p. 13).

“assigning tiles to objects”: Using 1-2-3’s step of assigning a cell to the cell information (see p. 13).

“displaying the tiles”: Using 1-2-3’s cell display (see pp. 13-15 and Figure 1.1).

It is noted that Using 1-2-3 does not specifically teach assigning a single tile to a group of objects and assigning a single tile to an individual object. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have employed such “assignments”, since Using 1-2-3 provides assignments which are at least suggestive of the claimed assignments. For example, Using 1-2-3’s assignment of +A1+B1 to cell C1 (see p. 16) is the assignment of A1 (object #1) and B1 (object #2) to single cell (“title”) D1. Therefore, Using 1-2-3 renders the claimed “title assignments” obvious, when the term “object” is given its broadest reasonable interpretation.

In regard to dependent claim 90, it is noted that Using 1-2-3 does not specifically teach the claimed steps of “moving”, “drawing”, and “repeating”. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to perform such “steps” since Using 1-2-3 teaches a display (see p. 49, Figure 2.6), which is generated in a functionally equivalent manner. Therefore, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to form a system upon which claim 90 reads.

Regarding dependent claim 91, Using 1-2-3’s step of deleting characters (pp. 66-68), deleting rows and columns of data (pp. 98-101) and deleting files (see pp. 277-278) are equivalent to the claimed steps of “eliminating an object”.

It is noted that Using 1-2-3 does not specifically teach a “prioritization list”. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide such a feature, since Using 1-2-3 teaches a menu (“list”) which provides different methods of data prioritization (see pp. 274-277). Data is

arranged according to the prioritization rules. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have formed a system upon which claim 91 reads.

Regarding dependent claim 92, Using 1-2-3 teaches the claimed text region and data region. For example, if cell C1 contains “ALPHA + 100”, the region of the cell containing the variable name ALPHA is the “text region”, while the region of the cell containing the value 100 is the “data region”. Therefore, Using 1-2-3 teaches the claimed “regions”.

In regard to dependent claim 93, Using 1-2-3 teaches the claimed:

“physical size”: Using 1-2-3’s width (see p. 19).

“display rule”: Using 1-2-3’s cell format (see p. 13).

“access table”: Using 1-2-3’s password function (see pp. 22-23).

“tile name”: Using 1-2-3’s row-column name (see p. 13).

It is noted that Using 1-2-3 does not specifically teach storage of “time entries”. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide such a feature, since Using 1-2-3 teaches date and time functions (see p. 18) which permits the capture of the current date and time from the system clock. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have formed a system upon which claim 93 reads.

In regard to dependent claim 94, it is noted that Using 1-2-3 does not explicitly teach “displaying a pop up menu” corresponding to a region of a tile. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide a pop-up menu, since Using 1-2-3 teaches the display of related data in a pop-up control panel upon the selection of a cell (see pp. 49-50). Furthermore, it should be noted that it is common knowledge to the skilled artisan to provide pop-up menus to enhance the user-friendliness of the user interface. In fact, Using 1-2-3 discusses the use of supplementary software programs which can be added to

Using 1-2-3 to improve said user-friendliness (e.g. pop-up notepad windows) (see pp. 33-35). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to form a system upon which claim 94 reads.

In regard to dependent claim 95, Using 1-2-3 teaches hiding columns (e.g. cells or “tiles”) in a spreadsheet (see p. 101), providing reasonable suggestion to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to refrain from displaying a column (e.g. tile(s) without any objects), providing the benefit of compacting a spreadsheet accordingly.

In regard to dependent claim 96, Using 1-2-3 teaches a keyboard (see p. 29 – at middle “1-2-3 uses virtually every key on the PC’s keyboard”).

In regard to dependent claim 97, Using 1-2-3 teaches text (see p. 98 Figure 4.18).

In regard to dependent claim 102, Using 1-2-3 teaches the IBM PC, as well as a color/monochrome monitor (see pp. 29-30). It was well known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that PCs typically comprised monitors which were/are forms of cathode ray tubes.

In regard to dependent claim 103, Using 1-2-3 teaches the shape of the overall displayed spreadsheet is at least dependent upon the conglomeration of each individual cell (tile) shape. Columns of tiles not displayed also influence the final spreadsheet shape (see p. 101 Figure at top of page, also section “Hiding Columns”).

In regard to dependent claim 104, Using 1-2-3 teaches individual cell (tile) shapes displayed accordingly, each rectangular in shape with selected widths, etc. (see p. 101).

In regard to dependent claim 105, Using 1-2-3 teaches tiles referenced by letters and numbers (see p. 101 – Figure at top of page).

In regard to dependent claim 106, Using 1-2-3 teaches editing data in a worksheet (see pp. 66-67). As Using 1-2-3 changes to EDIT mode, the contents of a cell is duplicated in the control panel for editing. Since Using 1-2-3 teaches editing of one cell at a time (see p. 67 at bottom), this provides reasonable suggestion to the skilled artisan at the time of the invention to apply editing of one cell while blocking editing of all other cells at the same time, so as to prevent conflicts.

In regard to dependent claims 107, 108, Using 1-2-3 teaches the claimed: “access table”: Using 1-2-3’s password function, which logs a user accordingly (see pp. 22-23).

It is noted that Using 1-2-3 does not specifically teach storage of recording a time of entry. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide such a feature, since Using 1-2-3 teaches date and time functions (see p. 18) which permits the capture of the current date and time from the system clock. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have formed a system upon which claim 108 reads.

In regard to dependent claim 109, Using 1-2-3 teaches changing a formula within a cell (see p. 67 – at bottom). It is noted that the editing of said formula results in a mixture of new and original data (e.g. D4 is changed to C4, all else is original).

In regard to dependent claim 110, Using 1-2-3 teaches an insertion point for editing original input (see p. 68). It is noted that Using 1-2-3 teaches a cursor position insert mode in the form of a marker (an underscore). As a new character is entered in EDIT mode (the letter “C”), said new letter is normally inserted to the left of the cursor, therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to differentiate between original data, and new data to be added, via knowledge of the tracking position of the taught cursor marker, providing the benefit of concise editing.

In regard to dependent claim 112, Using 1-2-3 teaches a control panel showing three lines to help a user as said user edits a cell accordingly (see pp. 49-51). In addition, since Using 1-2-3 possesses the capability of saving, copying, editing, etc. these features are made available to the user as said user targets a cell accordingly, therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide said capability to each cell for better organization of a spreadsheet (see also pp. 66-68).

In regard to dependent claim 113, Using 1-2-3 teaches editing data (making an entry) in a cell of a spreadsheet (see pp. 66-68).

In regard to independent claim 114, Using 1-2-3 teaches the claimed steps of:
“*entering a command...to display a form*”: Using 1-2-3’s File Retrieve Instruction (see pp. 756-757).
“*obtaining an object list*”: Using 1-2-3’s step of obtaining cell information, e.g. numbers, text and formulas (see p. 13).
“*assigning tiles to objects*”: Using 1-2-3’s step of assigning a cell to the cell information (see p. 13).
“*displaying the tiles*”: Using 1-2-3’s cell display (see pp. 13-15 and Figure 1.1).

It is noted that Using 1-2-3 does not specifically teach assigning a single tile to a group of objects and assigning a single tile to an individual object. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have employed such “assignments”, since Using 1-2-3 provides assignments which are at least suggestive of the claimed assignments. For example, Using 1-2-3’s assignment of +A1+B1 to cell C1 (see p. 16) is the assignment of A1 (object #1) and B1 (object #2) to single cell (“title”) D1.

Therefore, Using 1-2-3 renders the claimed “title assignments” obvious, when the term “object” is given its broadest reasonable interpretation.

In regard to dependent claim 115, Using 1-2-3 teaches hiding columns (e.g. cells or “tiles”) in a spreadsheet (see p. 101), providing reasonable suggestion to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to refrain from displaying a column (e.g. tile(s) without any objects), providing the benefit of compacting a spreadsheet accordingly.

In regard to dependent claim 116, Using 1-2-3 teaches a keyboard (see p. 29 – at middle “1-2-3 uses virtually every key on the PC’s keyboard”).

In regard to dependent claim 117, Using 1-2-3 teaches text (see p. 98 Figure 4.18).

In regard to dependent claim 120, Using 1-2-3 teaches the IBM PC, as well as a color/monochrome monitor (see pp. 29-30). It was well known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that PCs typically comprised monitors which were/are forms of cathode ray tubes.

In regard to dependent claim 121, Using 1-2-3 teaches the shape of the overall displayed spreadsheet is at least dependent upon the conglomeration of each individual cell (tile) shape. Columns of tiles not displayed also influence the final spreadsheet shape (see p. 101 Figure at top of page, also section “Hiding Columns”).

In regard to dependent claim 122, Using 1-2-3 teaches individual cell (tile) shapes displayed accordingly, each rectangular in shape with selected widths, etc. (see p. 101).

In regard to dependent claim 123, Using 1-2-3 teaches tiles referenced by letters and numbers (see p. 101 – Figure at top of page).

In regard to dependent claim 124, Using 1-2-3 teaches editing data in a worksheet (see pp. 66-67). As Using 1-2-3 changes to EDIT mode, the contents of a cell is duplicated in the control panel for editing. Since Using 1-2-3 teaches editing of one cell at a time (see p. 67 at bottom), this provides reasonable suggestion to the skilled artisan at the time of the invention to apply editing of one cell while blocking editing of all other cells at the same time, so as to prevent conflicts.

In regard to dependent claims 125, 126, Using 1-2-3 teaches the claimed: “access table”: Using 1-2-3’s password function, which logs a user accordingly (see pp. 22-23).

It is noted that Using 1-2-3 does not specifically teach storage of recording a time of entry. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide such a feature, since Using 1-2-3 teaches date and time functions (see p. 18) which permits the capture of the current date and time from the system clock. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have formed a system upon which claim 126 reads.

In regard to dependent claim 127, Using 1-2-3 teaches changing a formula within a cell (see p. 67 – at bottom). It is noted that the editing of said formula results in a mixture of new and original data (e.g. D4 is changed to C4, all else is original).

In regard to dependent claim 128, Using 1-2-3 teaches an insertion point for editing original input (see p. 68). It is noted that Using 1-2-3 teaches a cursor position insert mode in the form of a marker (an underscore). As a new character is entered in EDIT mode (the letter “C”), said new letter is normally inserted to the left of the cursor, therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to differentiate between original data, and new data to be added, via knowledge of the tracking position of the taught cursor marker, providing the benefit of concise editing.

In regard to dependent claim 130, Using 1-2-3 teaches a control panel showing three lines to help a user as said user edits a cell accordingly (see pp. 49-51). In addition, since Using 1-2-3 possesses the capability of saving, copying, editing, etc. these features are made available to the user as said user targets a cell accordingly, therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide said capability to each cell for better organization of a spreadsheet (see also pp. 66-68).

In regard to dependent claim 131, Using 1-2-3 teaches editing data (making an entry) in a cell of a spreadsheet (see pp. 66-68).

In regard to independent claim 132, claim 132 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 1, and is rejected along the same rationale.

9. **Claims 13, 17, 27, 36, 46, 49-51, 55-63, 64-72, 76-85, 86-88, 101, 111, 119, 129 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Using 1-2-3 Special Edition (hereinafter Using 1-2-3), cited in Applicant's submitted IDS, in view of Cobb et al., Excel In Business (hereinafter Excel), 1985 The Cobb Group, Microsoft Press, pp. 39-40, 68-70, 284-288.**

In regard to dependent claim 13, Using 1-2-3 does not specifically teach a second command to display a second form, the object being associated with the second form, a second object list etc. However, Excel teaches linking multiple active worksheets by referencing the second worksheet name in a cell formula, both worksheet displayed accordingly (Excel pp. 284-286, Figures 8-28, 8-29). It would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Excel to Using 1-2-3, providing Using 1-2-3 the benefit of linking multiple spreadsheet forms, facilitating analysis of a greater range of data.

In regard to dependent claim 17, Using 1-2-3 does not specifically teach tiles as windows. However, Excel teaches a cell that is used for both display of data, and for inserting/editing data (a form of window) (Excel p. 40 – bottom half). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Excel to Using 1-2-3, providing Using 1-2-3 the benefit of using cells (tiles) as windows for ease of use.

In regard to dependent claim 27, Using 1-2-3 does not specifically teach integrity checks of ranges. However, Excel teaches displaying error values associated with formula errors etc. (Excel pp. 68-70). It is noted that Excel page 70 (top half) teaches errors relating to ranges. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Excel's error checking to Using 1-2-3's error reporting, providing Using 1-2-3 the benefit of range checking, ensuring error-free spreadsheets.

In regard to dependent claim 46, Using 1-2-3 does not specifically teach integrity checks of ranges. However, Excel teaches displaying error values associated with formula errors etc. (Excel pp. 68-70). It is noted that Excel page 70 (top half) teaches errors relating to ranges. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Excel's error checking to Using 1-2-3's error reporting, providing Using 1-2-3 the benefit of range checking, ensuring error-free spreadsheets.

In regard to dependent claim 36, Using 1-2-3 does not specifically teach tiles as windows. However, Excel teaches a cell that is used for both display of data, and for inserting/editing data (a form of window) (Excel p. 40 – bottom half). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to apply Excel to Using 1-2-3, providing Using 1-2-3 the benefit of using cells (tiles) as windows for ease of use.

In regard to independent claim 49, Using 1-2-3 teaches the claimed steps of:

“*entering a command...to display a form*”: Using 1-2-3’s File Retrieve Instruction (see pp. 756-757).

“*obtaining an object list*”: Using 1-2-3’s step of obtaining cell information, e.g. numbers, text and formulas (see p. 13).

“*assigning tiles to objects*”: Using 1-2-3’s step of assigning a cell to the cell information (see p. 13).

“*displaying the tiles*”: Using 1-2-3’s cell display (see pp. 13-15 and Figure 1.1).

It is noted that Using 1-2-3 does not specifically teach assigning a single tile to a group of objects and assigning a single tile to an individual object. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have employed such “assignments”, since Using 1-2-3 provides assignments which are at least suggestive of the claimed assignments. For example, Using 1-2-3’s assignment of +A1+B1 to cell C1 (see p. 16) is the assignment of A1 (object #1) and B1 (object #2) to single cell (“title”) D1. Therefore, Using 1-2-3 renders the claimed “title assignments” obvious, when the term “object” is given its broadest reasonable interpretation.

Using 1-2-3’s step of deleting characters (pp. 66-68), deleting rows and columns of data (pp. 98-101) and deleting files (see pp. 277-278) are equivalent to the claimed steps of “eliminating an object”.

Using 1-2-3 does not specifically teach a second command to display a second form, the object being associated with the second form. However, Excel teaches linking multiple active worksheets by referencing the second worksheet name in a cell formula, both worksheet displayed accordingly (Excel pp. 284-286, Figures 8-28, 8-29). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Excel to Using 1-2-3, providing Using 1-2-3 the benefit of linking multiple spreadsheet forms, facilitating analysis of a greater range of data.

Using 1-2-3 teaches hiding columns (e.g. cells or “tiles”) in a spreadsheet (see p. 101), providing reasonable suggestion to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to refrain from displaying a column (e.g. tile(s) without any objects), providing the benefit of compacting a spreadsheet accordingly to save space.

In regard to dependent claim 50, Using 1-2-3 teaches a keyboard (see p. 29 – at middle “1-2-3 uses virtually every key on the PC’s keyboard”).

In regard to dependent claim 51, Using 1-2-3 teaches text (see p. 98 Figure 4.18).

In regard to dependent claim 55, Using 1-2-3 does not specifically teach tiles as windows. However, Excel teaches a cell that is used for both display of data, and for inserting/editing data (a form of window) (Excel p. 40 – bottom half). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Excel to Using 1-2-3, providing Using 1-2-3 the benefit of using cells (tiles) as windows for ease of use.

In regard to dependent claim 56, Using 1-2-3 teaches the IBM PC, as well as a color/monochrome monitor (see pp. 29-30). It was well known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that PCs typically comprised monitors which were/are forms of cathode ray tubes.

In regard to dependent claim 57, Using 1-2-3 teaches the shape of the overall displayed spreadsheet is at least dependent upon the conglomeration of each individual cell (tile) shape. Columns of tiles not displayed also influence the final spreadsheet shape (see p. 101 Figure at top of page, also section “Hiding Columns”).

In regard to dependent claim 58, Using 1-2-3 teaches individual cell (tile) shapes displayed accordingly, each rectangular in shape with selected widths, etc. (see p. 101).

In regard to dependent claim 59, Using 1-2-3 teaches tiles referenced by letters and numbers (see p. 101 – Figure at top of page).

In regard to dependent claim 60, Using 1-2-3 teaches editing data in a worksheet (see pp. 66-67). As Using 1-2-3 changes to EDIT mode, the contents of a cell is duplicated in the control panel for editing. Since Using 1-2-3 teaches editing of one cell at a time (see p. 67 at bottom), this provides reasonable suggestion to the skilled artisan at the time of the invention to apply editing of one cell while blocking editing of all other cells at the same time, so as to prevent conflicts.

In regard to dependent claims 61, 62, Using 1-2-3 teaches the claimed: “access table”: Using 1-2-3’s password function, which logs a user accordingly (see pp. 22-23).

It is noted that Using 1-2-3 does not specifically teach storage of recording a time of entry. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide such a feature, since Using 1-2-3 teaches date and time functions (see p. 18) which permits the capture of the current date and time from the system clock. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have formed a system upon which claim 62 reads.

In regard to dependent claim 63, Using 1-2-3 teaches changing a formula within a cell (see p. 67 – at bottom). It is noted that the editing of said formula results in a mixture of new and original data (e.g. D4 is changed to C4, all else is original).

In regard to dependent claim 64, Using 1-2-3 teaches an insertion point for editing original input (see p. 68). It is noted that Using 1-2-3 teaches a cursor position insert mode in the form of a marker (an underscore). As a new character is entered in EDIT mode (the letter “C”), said new letter is normally inserted to the left of the cursor, therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to differentiate between original data, and new data to be added, via knowledge of the tracking position of the taught cursor marker, providing the benefit of concise editing.

In regard to dependent claim 65, Using 1-2-3 does not specifically teach integrity checks of ranges. However, Excel teaches displaying error values associated with formula errors etc. (Excel pp. 68-70). It is noted that Excel page 70 (top half) teaches errors relating to ranges. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Excel’s error checking to Using 1-2-3’s error reporting, providing Using 1-2-3 the benefit of range checking, ensuring error-free spreadsheets.

In regard to dependent claim 66, Using 1-2-3 teaches a control panel showing three lines to help a user as said user edits a cell accordingly (see pp. 49-51). In addition, since Using 1-2-3 possesses the capability of saving, copying, editing, etc. these features are made available to the user as said user targets a cell accordingly, therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide said capability to each cell for better organization of a spreadsheet (see also pp. 66-68).

In regard to dependent claim 67, Using 1-2-3 teaches editing data (making an entry) in a cell of a spreadsheet (see pp. 66-68).

In regard to independent claim 68, Using 1-2-3 teaches the claimed steps of:

“*entering a command...to display a form*”: Using 1-2-3’s File Retrieve Instruction (see pp. 756-757).

“*obtaining an object list*”: Using 1-2-3’s step of obtaining cell information, e.g. numbers, text and formulas (see p. 13).

“*assigning tiles to objects*”: Using 1-2-3’s step of assigning a cell to the cell information (see p. 13).

“*displaying the tiles*”: Using 1-2-3’s cell display (see pp. 13-15 and Figure 1.1).

It is noted that Using 1-2-3 does not specifically teach assigning a single tile to a group of objects and assigning a single tile to an individual object. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have employed such “assignments”, since Using 1-2-3 provides assignments which are at least suggestive of the claimed assignments. For example, Using 1-2-3’s assignment of +A1+B1 to cell C1 (see p. 16) is the assignment of A1 (object #1) and B1 (object #2) to single cell (“title”) D1. Therefore, Using 1-2-3 renders the claimed “title assignments” obvious, when the term “object” is given its broadest reasonable interpretation.

Using 1-2-3 does not specifically teach an object that is not part of said group of objects is associated with a second tile. However, Excel teaches linking multiple active worksheets by referencing the second worksheet name in a cell formula, both worksheet displayed accordingly (Excel pp. 284-286, Figures 8-28, 8-29). It is noted that Excel p.285 teaches “LinkTest2!”, which can be fairly interpreted as an object in an object list, but not part of a first group of objects. LinkTest! is associated in another cell (tile) and references data objects etc. from another spreadsheet accordingly. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Excel to Using 1-2-3, providing Using 1-2-3 the benefit of linking multiple spreadsheet forms, facilitating analysis of a greater range of data.

In regard to dependent claim 69, Using 1-2-3 does not specifically teach an object that is not part of said group of objects is associated with a second tile. However, Excel teaches linking multiple active worksheets

by referencing the second worksheet name in a cell formula, both worksheet displayed accordingly (Excel pp. 284-286, Figures 8-28, 8-29). It is noted that Excel p.285 teaches “LinkTest2!”, which can be fairly interpreted as an object in an object list, but not part of a first group of objects. LinkTest! is associated in another cell (tile) and references data objects etc. from another spreadsheet accordingly. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Excel to Using 1-2-3, providing Using 1-2-3 the benefit of linking multiple spreadsheet forms, facilitating analysis of a greater range of data.

In regard to dependent claims 70-72, 76-85, 86-88, said claims reflect the methods comprising computer readable steps used for implementing the system as claimed in claims 12, 14-15, 17-26, 27-29 respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 101, Using 1-2-3 does not specifically teach tiles as windows. However, Excel teaches a cell that is used for both display of data, and for inserting/editing data (a form of window) (Excel p. 40 – bottom half). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Excel to Using 1-2-3, providing Using 1-2-3 the benefit of using cells (tiles) as windows for ease of use.

In regard to dependent claim 111, Using 1-2-3 does not specifically teach integrity checks of ranges. However, Excel teaches displaying error values associated with formula errors etc. (Excel pp. 68-70). It is noted that Excel page 70 (top half) teaches errors relating to ranges. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Excel’s error checking to Using 1-2-3’s error reporting, providing Using 1-2-3 the benefit of range checking, ensuring error-free spreadsheets.

In regard to dependent claim 119, Using 1-2-3 does not specifically teach tiles as windows. However, Excel teaches a cell that is used for both display of data, and for inserting/editing data (a form of window)

(Excel p. 40 – bottom half). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Excel to Using 1-2-3, providing Using 1-2-3 the benefit of using cells (tiles) as windows for ease of use.

In regard to dependent claim 129, Using 1-2-3 does not specifically teach integrity checks of ranges. However, Excel teaches displaying error values associated with formula errors etc. (Excel pp. 68-70). It is noted that Excel page 70 (top half) teaches errors relating to ranges. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply Excel's error checking to Using 1-2-3's error reporting, providing Using 1-2-3 the benefit of range checking, ensuring error-free spreadsheets.

10. **Claims 16, 33-35, 98-100, 118 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Using 1-2-3 Special Edition (hereinafter Using 1-2-3), cited in Applicant's submitted IDS, in view of McDonald et al. (hereinafter McDonald), The Benefits of Automated Medical Record Systems For Ambulatory Care, Tenth Annual Symposium on Computer Applications in Medical Care, 1986, pp. 157-171 (cited in Applicant's submitted IDS).**

In regard to dependent claim 16, 33-35, 98-100, 118, Using 1-2-3 does not specifically teach blood pressure, vital signs, and lab information. However, McDonald teaches an automated record system for medical care, whereby blood pressure (a vital sign), along with other lab data, are stored, retrieved, and displayed as a table (McDonald p. 159 – near bottom of figure “VITALS”). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the lab and blood pressure records to Using 1-2-3's table display, providing Using 1-2-3's spreadsheet the benefit of McDonald's data for more accurate record manipulation, searching, and displaying.

11. **Claims 52-54, 73-75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Using 1-2-3 Special Edition (hereinafter Using 1-2-3), cited in Applicant's submitted IDS, in view of Cobb et al., Excel In Business (hereinafter Excel), 1985 The Cobb Group, Microsoft Press, pp. 39-40, 68-70, 284-288, and further in view of McDonald et al. (hereinafter McDonald), The Benefits of Automated Medical Record Systems For Ambulatory Care, Tenth Annual Symposium on Computer Applications in Medical Care, 1986, pp. 157-171 (cited in Applicant's submitted IDS).**

In regard to dependent claim 52-54, 73-75, Using 1-2-3 does not specifically teach blood pressure, vital signs, and lab information. However, McDonald teaches an automated record system for medical care, whereby blood pressure (a vital sign), along with other lab data, are stored, retrieved, and displayed as a table (McDonald p. 159 – near bottom of figure “VITALS”). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to apply the lab and blood pressure records to Using 1-2-3’s table display, providing Using 1-2-3’s spreadsheet the benefit of McDonald’s data for more accurate record manipulation, searching, and displaying.

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments filed 3/23/2007 have been fully and carefully considered but they are not persuasive.

In regard to Applicant's argument and amendment directed to the instant rejection under 35 U.S.C. 251 (page 28 of amendment), Applicant asserts that the claims in question are presently narrowed by the addition of the word “respectively”. It is the examiner's opinion that the limitation, as presently claimed, does not serve to overcome the above rejection. Using instant claim 1 as a representative example, the limitation in question now recites in pertinent part: “*assigning a plurality of tiles to each of said objects, respectively, in said object list*”.

Eliminating the word “respectively” results in assigning a plurality of tiles (i.e. tile1, tile2) to each of said objects (i.e. object1, then object2, etc.). Accordingly, we now assign (tile1, tile2) to (object1), then assign (tile1, tile2) to (object2),...etc. This pattern of assignment is performed “respectively” to each object until completed, which is equivalent to Applicant’s amendment. It is also respectfully noted that “assigning” is substantially equivalent to “associating”. Therefore, the instant rejection under 35 U.S.C 251 is respectfully maintained.

In regard to Applicant’s arguments directed to the instant rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 first paragraph (page 28 of amendment), Applicant asserts that the instant specification teaches assigning a plurality of tiles to each object, and cites specification column 6 lines 59-61 in support of Applicant’s position. The examiner respectfully disagrees. The specification recitation “tiles are designed to display the various forms of objects” appears to be a general definition of what tiles are designed to do, and falls short of providing specific support of the instantly claimed “*assigning a plurality of tiles to each of said objects...*”. In addition, the specification recitation “There is not one tile for each object but one tile for each form of object”, fails to provide specific support for the above claim limitation in question, since the above recitation does not disclose a plurality of tiles for each object (or form of object). The same hold true for specification column 6 lines 3-5 : “In addition to the two standard types of tiles (horizontal and vertical) there may be other tiles displaying data in different fashions.”. This recitation teaches that there may be a plurality of tiles, but it fall short of supporting “*assigning a plurality of tiles to each of said objects...*”. In view of the above analysis, the examiner respectfully maintains the instant rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 first paragraph.

Applicant argues on page 29, and 31 of the amendment that the cited art of record does not teach Applicant’s invention as claimed, especially in regard to automatically processing without human intervention limitations

(b) - (d) of representative claim 1. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Although the examiner respectfully maintains that the instant claims do not preclude human interaction, assuming arguendo that Applicant’s position is adopted (the Office is not admitting this), then the claimed limitations can fall within the scope of a user reopening a spreadsheet document in a computer. If a spreadsheet is first created, then saved as a

spreadsheet file by said user, the reopening of said file (i.e. via ENTER command) causes the computer to automatically reconstruct the visible customized spreadsheet from the saved data and rules within the saved file. The computer obtains the object list, and tiles are assigned and displayed accordingly, all pursuant to a user entering a command.

Applicant argues on page 30 of the amendment that reference 1-2-3 is static, inasmuch as said reference stores spreadsheet information accordingly until a user changes it. Applicant asserts that spreadsheet (1-2-3) never changes – the information will appear according to how the user enters it, and also asserts that the information in 1-2-3 does not change based on “objects” in an “object list”. The examiner respectfully disagrees. It is respectfully submitted that if another unrelated 1-2-3 spreadsheet is open and visible, opening another saved spreadsheet causes the computer to dynamically change (assign, associate, etc.) tiles to different objects accordingly. A new object list is created commensurate with a newly opened file, etc.

Applicant argues on page 31 that 1-2-3 does not specifically teach assigning a single tile to a group of objects and assigning a single tile to an individual object. The examiner respectfully maintains that 1-2-3 provides assignments which are at least suggestive of the claimed assignments. For example, Using 1-2-3’s assignment of +A1+B1 to cell C1 (see p. 16) reflects an assignment of A1 (object #1) and B1 (object #2) to single cell (“title”) D1. Reference 1-2-3 displays results on a monitor accordingly.

Applicant notes on page 31 (at bottom) of the amendment that the independent claims have been amended to include claim language that previously put claims 1 and 7 in condition for allowance over the cited references. It is respectfully noted that the instant case is under reissue examination due to a 35 U.S.C 112 issue precipitated by an opposing party during litigation (see Statement Of Inoperativeness filed 8/3/2006). It is the examiner’s opinion that since Applicant’s arguments are unpersuasive (as per above), amending the limitation in question back to its original state at the time of the previous allowance does not overcome the examiner’s rejection of the pending claims under 35 U.S.C. 112.

Applicant's arguments on page 32-33 of the amendment are directed to the assertion that the pending claims not previously discussed are allowable based upon alleged allowable base claims. The examiner respectfully disagrees, please see above.

Conclusion

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William L. Bashore whose telephone number is (571) 272-4088. The examiner can normally be reached on 11:30am - 8:00pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on (571) 272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

14. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

William L. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER

April 27, 2007